

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

JOHNATHAN THOMAS MATTHEWS, JR., *
Petitioner,

v.

* CIVIL ACTION NO. PJM-14-3222

FRANK B. BISHOP, JR., *et al.* *
Respondents.

ORDER

On October 14, 2014, the Court received for filing the instant self-represented 28 U.S.C. § 2254 Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus relief, dated October 6, 2014, raising a direct attack on Johnathan Matthews' convictions in the Circuit Court for Charles County, Maryland. Matthews raised the following claims: (1) his sentence to life without the possibility of parole while a juvenile violates the Eighth Amendment's prohibition against cruel and unusual punishment; (2) he was not present when the jurors sent several notes to the court during jury deliberations; (3) counsel provided ineffective assistance; and (4) the cumulative effect of trial, post-conviction and appellate counsels' errors established ineffective assistance. ECF No. 1-1. On December 4, 2014, Respondents provided a court-ordered response. ECF No. 3. Matthews filed a self-represented Reply. ECF No. 4.

On January 5, 2015, counsel entered an appearance on behalf of Matthews. Soon after the Court began to receive, and grant, Matthews' counsel's Motions for Extension of Time to file a supplement to the self-represented Reply. The majority of the requests were filed with the consent of Respondents. *See* ECF Nos. 8-15 & 17-24. The extensions extend over a two-year period, from March of 2015 to September 14, 2017.

As noted, the most recent consent Motion was granted to September 14, 2017. Counsel has, unfortunately, not filed a Supplemental Reply, nor sought further extensions.¹ Counsel shall be required to show cause why the Petition for habeas corpus should not be ruled upon as currently pled. If no response is received, the Court shall rule accordingly.

Accordingly, it is this 14th day of December, 2017, by the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, hereby ORDERED that:

1. Counsel SHALL SHOW CAUSE, on or before January 8, 2018, why the Petition should not be ruled upon as currently pled; and
2. The Clerk SHALL SEND a copy of this Order to counsel of record.

_____/s/_____
PETER J. MESSITTE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ In October of 2017, Court personnel contacted counsel in an effort to remind him of his non-compliance and to clarify what action would be forthcoming.